

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-19 are all of the claims pending in the application.

**I. Summary of the Office Action**

The Examiner withdrew the rejection of claims 1-9, 13, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), however, the claims are now rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Claims 10-12 and 14 remain rejected and newly added claims 16-19 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-9, 13, 15, 16, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,950,111 to Georger et al. (hereinafter “Georger”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,150,896 to Decramer et al. (hereinafter “Decramer”). Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Georger in view of Decramer and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,323,427 to Rutledge et al. (hereinafter “Rutledge”). Claims 11, 12, 14, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Georger in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,901,340 to Flickinger et al. (hereinafter “Flickinger”). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections at least in view of the following comments.

Turning first to claim 1, the Examiner alleges that FIG. 4, element 46 of Georger discloses the claimed “output coaxial cable (53) adapted for connection to a television set (5)” (*see* page 3 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Element 46 of Georger is not an output coaxial cable but instead is a modular output plug that is engaged by a modular jack (*i.e.*, an end connector for a twisted pair cable comprising 4

pairs of twisted wires) (*see* col. 3, lines 36-50 of Georger). In FIG. 4 of Georger, the cable 32 is a twisted pair cable (*see* col. 3, lines 16-18 of Georger).

Additionally, the Examiner alleges that the claimed “first input processing unit (1) comprising a coaxial input terminal (10), at least one low current terminal (11) for twisted wire pairs and processing means (14) for processing TV signals output from the coaxial cable so as to transform them into signals with substantially the same transmission characteristics on the same frequency band on a twisted wires pair” is the same as the splitting means 14 according to Georger (*see* page 3 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Firstly, the splitting means only splits the coaxial signal into a group of signals of the same type (*i.e.*, coaxial signals). Georger does not disclose or suggest that the splitting means 14 is a processing means able to transform the signal. Secondly, the cable 16 according to Georger is not a twisted pair cable, but rather is a coaxial cable. For example, col. 3, lines 16-18 of Georger discloses that “[t]he coupling means passes the output signals to the unshielded twisted-pair cables 32.” Thus, the output signals are not unshielded twisted-pair signals when arriving at the coupling means. A person of ordinary skill in the art would understand based on the disclosure at col. 2, line 10 of Georger that the cable 16 from the splitter is not a twisted-pair cable.

The Examiner further alleges that the claimed “at least one second output processing unit (3) comprising a low current input port (33) for twisted wire pairs, a coaxial output terminal (31) and processing means (34) for processing signals output from a twisted wires pair (12) connected to the first input processing unit (1) so as to transform them into signals substantially identical to the signals output from the said coaxial cable (41)” is the same as the terminating means 30 according to Georger (*see* page 4 of the Office Action). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Instead, element 30 according to Georger is merely a terminating means, *i.e.*, a 100 ohms resistor mounted at the output to match the impedance of a typical 4-pairs twisted cable (*see* col. 3, lines 18-24 of Georger). Thus, terminating means 30 has a coaxial input and a twisted pair output—the opposite configuration compared to the claimed second output processing unit, which comprises a low current input port for twisted wire pairs, and a coaxial output terminal.

The Examiner also alleges that Georger discloses “at least one connecting cable (12, 23) consisting of twisted wire pairs connecting the first processing unit (1) to the second processing unit (3),” as recited in claim 1. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

According to Georger, the cable 16 connecting the splitting means and the coupling means is a not a twisted-pair cable but rather is a coaxial cable (*see* col. 3, lines 15-24 of Georger).

Decramer does not cure these deficiencies of Georger. At least for these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the combination of Georger and Decramer.

Turning to claim 2, Applicant respectfully submits that Georger does not disclose “the first input processing unit (1) comprises means of cutting off (16) the signal transmission in the case in which a cable consisting of twisted wire pairs (12) is not connected to the low current output terminal (11) of the first input processing unit (1),” as recited in claim 2.

Instead of disclosing a cutting off means, Georger discloses a terminating means, which a person of ordinary skill in the art would understand to be very different from the claimed cutting off means. The claimed cutting off means cuts the signal at the first input processing unit, whereas the terminating means 30 according to Georger terminates the output, *i.e.*, loads the loop between 4 and 5 (*see* FIG. 5 of Georger).

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully notes that the Examiner alleges with respect to claim 1 that the terminating means 30 according to Georger is the same as the claimed second output processing unit, and not the first input processing unit. Accordingly, even if, *arguendo*, the claimed second output processing unit is the same as the terminating means 30 according to Georger, though Applicant does not concede this to be the case, the terminating means 30 (alleged cutting off means) are not part of the first input processing unit, as required by claim 2.

At least for these reasons, as well as for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2 is patentable over Georger.

Turning to claim 3, Applicant respectfully submits that Georger fails to disclose the claimed detecting means. According to Georger, when a connector is plugged into the terminating means 30, the 100 ohms resistor is shunted or bypassed (and therefore inactive), and when no connector is plugged into the terminating means 30, the resistor is loaded (*see* col. 3, lines 36-55 of Georger). Thus, the terminating means disclosed by Georger do not need detecting means. In the claimed invention, however, the detecting means is necessary, because there is a cutting off means, rather than a terminating means.

At least for this reason, as well as for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 3 is patentable over the combination of Georger and Decramer.

Turning to claim 4, Applicant respectfully submits that Georger fails to disclose the claimed cutting off means. Instead, as discussed above, Georger discloses a terminating means. Secondly, the terminating means according to Georger is not located in splitting means (alleged first input processing unit). Thirdly, Georger does not disclose any coaxial output terminal. Fourthly, according to Georger, the terminating means does not cut off the signal at the splitter.

At least for these reasons, as well as for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 is patentable over the combination of Georger and Decramer.

Claims 15 and 16 recite features similar to, although not necessarily coextensive with, at least some of the features discussed above with respect to claims 1-4. For example, claim 15 recites the following features:

processing means (14) for transforming TV signals output from the input terminal in signals with substantially the same transmission characteristics on the same frequency band and that can be transmitted for a twisted wires pair

means of cutting off (16) the signal transmission acting on the input side of output terminals (11) to cut off the signal transmission at an output terminal that is not connected indirectly, advantageously through a second output processing unit (3) connected to the said terminal through a cable consisting of twisted wire pairs, to a coaxial cable (53) connected to a TV set (5)

Claim 16, for example, recites an input processing unit, an output processing unit, an output coaxial cable, and a twisted wire pair cable connecting the first input processing unit to the second output processing unit.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 15 and 16 are patentable over the combination of Georger and Decramer at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1-4.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5-9, 13, and 19 are patentable over Georger and Decramer at least by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 16. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10-12, 14, 17, and 18 are patentable over Georger and Decramer at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 1 and 16, as discussed above. The disclosure of Rutledge and Flickinger does not cure the deficiencies of Georger and Decramer as discussed

above with respect to independent claims 1 and 16. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 is patentable over Georger in view of Decramer and Rutledge and that claims 11, 12, 14, 17, and 18 are patentable over Georger in view of Flickinger.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Eric S. Barr/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 5, 2008

Eric S. Barr  
Registration No. 60,150